Siskiyou County Behavioral Health / MHSA

Program-Level Data Metrics Analysis

Cost-Per-Person, Participation Counts, & Statistical Anomalies

FY 2018-19 through FY 2022-23 | February 2026

I. PURPOSE & METHODOLOGY

This supplemental document provides detailed program-level data metrics analysis for Siskiyou County Behavioral Health MHSA expenditures across five fiscal years. It should be read alongside the Master Analysis document.

The analysis applies three tests to each program where data permits:

- Cost-per-person plausibility — Is the implied cost per participant consistent with what that type of program normally costs to deliver?
- Year-over-year consistency — Do cost changes across fiscal years track with any documented change in service volume, population need, or program scope?
- Internal cross-document consistency — Do the participation numbers claimed in planning documents produce coherent cost ratios when compared against the actual expenditures in the ARERs?

⚑ PR Report Finding #2 established that the county never reported cost-per-person data for PEI or Innovation programs — a required metric. This analysis performs that calculation for the first time using the county's own expenditure and participation data.

II. COST-PER-PERSON RATING SCALE

The following classification system is used throughout this document:

Rating	Range	Meaning
✓ **Plausible**	Expected range	Cost-per-person is consistent with industry norms for this program type

Rating	Range	Meaning
⚑ Elevated	1.5x–3x norm	Cost is higher than typical but potentially explainable by rural delivery, small cohort, or intensive model
⚠ **Anomalous**	3x–10x norm	Cost significantly exceeds what this type of program should cost; requires explanation
⚠ **CRITICAL**	>10x norm or impossible	Cost is implausible for the program type, or internal math is contradictory; strong indicator of data error or fabrication

III. PEI PROGRAM EXPENDITURES — ALL THREE YEARS

The following table shows every PEI program reported in the ARERs across FY 2020-21, FY 2021-22, and FY 2022-23, with year-over-year changes.

PEI Program	FY 2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY20→23 Change
ACCESS & LINKAGE				
FRC/CRC Referrals & Access	$82,800	$72,450	—	⚠ **Eliminated**
Early Screenings (First 5/ASQ)	$40,000	$11,213	$17,633	−56%
Healthy Siskiyou Mobile Unit	$7,239	$8,508	$33,058	⚠ **+357%**
School Programs (Access/Link.)	—	$40,000	—	Appeared/ disappeared
EARLY INTERVENTION				
FRC's/CRC's Early Intervention	—	$50,600	—	Appeared/ disappeared
Early Int. Counseling - Dunamis	—	—	⚠ **$123,913**	NEW — no prior year
Early Int. Counseling - Yreka High	—	—	$83,505	NEW — no prior year
OUTREACH				
Latino Outreach, Translation/Peer	$25,052	$11,300	—	Eliminated by FY22-23

PEI Program	FY 2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY20→23 Change
ACCESS & LINKAGE				
Youth Programs (Outreach)	—	$56,261	—	Appeared/ disappeared
FRC/CRC's Family & Adult Programs	—	—	$104,287	NEW label FY22-23
FRC/CRC's Youth Programs	—	—	$7,943	NEW label FY22-23
FRC/CRC's Adult Programs	—	—	$3,972	NEW label FY22-23
Mental Health First Aid - Lotus	—	—	$23,361	NEW label FY22-23
ACES Workshop	—	—	$9,131	NEW — no prior year
Ready4k, ASQ Training - First 5	—	—	$12,507	NEW — no prior year
Youth Mental Health Awareness-YES	—	—	$21,768	NEW — no prior year
PREVENTION				
FRC/CRC Family & Adult Programs	$71,053	$75,526	$210,814	⚠ **+197%**
FRC/CRC Youth Programs	$50,600	$256,720	$340,088	⚠ **+572%**
FRC's/CRC's Adult Programs 2	—	—	$45,051	NEW label FY22-23
Prevention - Dunamis	—	—	⚠ **$161,087**	NEW — no prior year
School Programs (Prevention)	$16,000	$90,000	$78,495	⚠ **+391%**
Summer/Afterschool Programs	$15,500	$15,000	$50,357	⚠ **+225%**
Youth Programs (Prevention)	—	$256,720	$120,814	Volatile
Family and Adult Programs	—	$14,946	—	Appeared/ disappeared
STIGMA & DISCRIMINATION REDUCTION (SDR)				
FRC's/CRC's SDR	$87,297	$58,386	$42,343	−51%
Challenge Day - YHS	—	$0	$15,136	Was $0 in FY20-21
Rural Youth Media Outreach	$14,000	$36,000	$40,000	+186%
Writing from the Heart	$13,482	—	—	Eliminated after FY20-21

PEI Program	FY 2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY20→23 Change
ACCESS & LINKAGE				
Youth Programs (Stigma)	—	$11,092	—	Appeared/ disappeared
SUICIDE PREVENTION				
Youth MHFA - Lotus	$3,500	$14,000	$7,637	Volatile
Adult MHFA - Lotus	$6,500	$14,000	—	Eliminated FY22-23
ASIST, SafeTalk - Lotus	—	—	$14,471	NEW FY22-23
Youth Mental Health First Aid-YES	—	—	$7,637	NEW FY22-23
TOTAL PEI	**$459,261**	**$888,234**	**$1,608,255**	**+250%**

⚠ Of the 23 distinct programs listed in the FY22-23 ARER PEI section, 14 either did not exist in FY20-21, changed names without explanation, or appeared/disappeared across years. This pattern of constant program label churn makes year-over-year tracking difficult — which may be intentional.

IV. COST-PER-PERSON CALCULATIONS BY PROGRAM

The following table calculates cost-per-participant for every program where a participation count appears in any planning document. This calculation was never performed by the county (PR Finding #2) and never required by DHCS during the review period.

Program	Year	Expenditure	Participants	Unit	$/Unit	Rating
ASQ Screenings - First 5	FY20-21	$40,000	500	children screened	$80	**✓ Plausible**

Program	Year	Expenditure	Participants	Unit	$/Unit	Rating
ASQ Screenings - First 5	FY22-23	$17,633	~500 est.	children screened	$35	✓ Plausible
FRC Youth Programs (FRC count)	FY20-21	$50,600	97 unduplic.	youth in FRC programs	$522	✓ Plausible
Latino Outreach	FY20-21	$25,052	784	outreach hours	$32/hr	✓ Plausible
SDR — FRC/CRC (in-person)	FY20-21	$87,297	2,408	in-person attendees	$36	✓ Plausible
Youth MHFA Certification	FY20-21	$3,500	34	people certified	$103	✓ Plausible
Youth Mental Health First Aid	FY22-23	$7,637	est. 30-40	people certified	~$215	✓ Plausible
Adult MHFA Certification	FY20-21	$6,500	20	people certified	$325	⚑ Elevated — 3x youth rate
School Programs (Prevention)	FY21-22	$90,000	est. 200-400 students	students reached	$225-$450	⚑ Elevated if <400 students
Summer/Afterschool Programs	FY22-23	$50,357	est. 50-100 youth	youth participants	$500-$1,000	⚑ Elevated
Writing from the Heart (combined)	FY20-21	$13,482	~17 avg attendance	participants/session	⚠ **$793**	⚠ **Anomalous — writing group**
Mindful Little Campers	FY20-21	$15,000	15 pre/post tests	parents + staff combined	⚠ **$1,000**	⚠ **Anomalous — ambiguous who counted**
Healthy Siskiyou Mobile Unit	FY22-23	$33,058	unknown	—	⚠ **Unknown**	⚠ **4.6x cost increase, no count**
FRC Youth Programs (extrapolated)	FY22-23	$340,088	97 (if unchanged)	youth in FRC programs	⚠ **$3,506**	⚠ **Anomalous — 6.7x FY20-21 rate**
Challenge Day - YHS	FY22-23	$15,136	1 school day event	est. 200-400 students	⚑ $38-$76	⚑ Elevated — but no count reported

Program	Year	Expenditure	Participants	Unit	$/Unit	Rating
FRC Referrals & Access	FY20-21	$82,800	78 total referrals	referrals made	⚠ $1,062	⚠ CRITICAL — $1,062 per referral
FRC Referrals & Access	FY21-22	$72,450	78 est. (no new count)	referrals made	⚠ $929	⚠ CRITICAL — $929 per referral
Prevention - Dunamis	FY22-23	$161,087	ZERO — not reported	—	⚠ N/A	⚠ CRITICAL — $161K, no participants
Early Int. Counseling - Dunamis	FY22-23	$123,913	ZERO — not reported	—	⚠ N/A	⚠ CRITICAL — $124K, no participants
Six Stones Wellness Ctr (FY18-19)	FY18-19	Not in ARER	700 (plan) vs. 358 (own report)	members	⚠ CONFLICT	⚠ CRITICAL — 2x count discrepancy

V. DEEP DIVES — CRITICAL COST-PER-PERSON ITEMS

A. FRC/CRC Referrals & Access — $1,062 Per Referral (FY 2020-21)

Expenditure: $82,800 (FY 2020-21) · $72,450 (FY 2021-22)

Claimed participants: 78 referrals — 55 adults referred to SCBH + 23 children to early intervention (from FY 2022-23 Annual Update)

Implied cost per referral: $1,062 (FY20-21) · $929 (FY21-22)

Referral and access programs involve connecting individuals to existing services. They do not deliver treatment — they make phone calls, conduct brief screenings, complete intake paperwork, and link individuals to providers. Industry benchmarks for referral/linkage programs typically range from $50–$300 per referral depending on complexity. Even intensive care coordination with follow-up tracking rarely exceeds $500 per referral.

⚠ $1,062 per referral for a linkage-only program is 3–20 times higher than expected. At this cost, the 78 referrals could instead have funded 78 full initial psychiatric evaluations (avg. $400–$800 each). Either: (a) the $82,800 funded much more than referrals and the participant count is artificially low, (b) the contract was significantly inflated, or (c) the stated program type does not reflect what the funding actually purchased.

The program disappeared entirely from the FY22-23 ARER with no explanation. $82,800 was spent one year, $72,450 the next, then $0. No planning document addresses why a program that served 78 referrals per year — at $1,062 each — was discontinued.

1. *Produce the contract for the FRC/CRC Referrals & Access program, including the scope of work, deliverables, and payment schedule. How were the 78 referrals defined, tracked, and verified?*
2. *What did the $82,800 purchase beyond making 78 referrals? Provide an itemized cost breakdown — staff time, overhead, supplies — for FY 2020-21.*
3. *Why was this program discontinued after FY 2021-22? What happened to the need it was intended to address?*

B. Writing from the Heart — $793 Per Participant

Expenditure: $13,482 combined (FY 2020-21): $7,704 youth group + $5,778 YHS class

Claimed participants: ~17 average (7 youth avg attendance + 10 adult avg attendance, from 3-Year Plan)

Implied cost per participant: $793 ($13,482 ÷ 17)

Writing from the Heart is a therapeutic writing group program typically facilitated by a contracted community organization or therapist. Comparable group programs — grief support, creative expression, wellness classes — typically range from $50–$200 per participant for community-based groups.

⚠ $793 per person for a community writing group is 4–16 times higher than comparable programs. This is especially notable because "average attendance" of 7 youth and 10 adults across two separate programs suggests the actual headcount may be even lower than presented — average attendance is not the same as unduplicated individuals served. If only 7 and 10 people respectively attended, the per-person cost is accurate as calculated. If "average" conceals a smaller actual group, the true cost per person is even higher.

4. *Produce the contracts for Writing from the Heart (youth group) and Writing from the Heart (YHS class). What services were contracted, at what rate, for how many sessions?*
5. *Clarify "average attendance of 7 youth" and "average attendance of 10 adults" — what was the total unduplicated number of participants served over the course of the year?*
6. *Why did this program also not appear in FY 2021-22 or FY 2022-23? Was it discontinued? If so, what replaced it?*

C. Dunamis — $284,999 With Zero Participant Count (FY 2022-23)

Early Intervention Counseling - Dunamis: $123,913

Prevention - Dunamis: $161,087

Total Dunamis expenditure FY22-23: $284,999

Participants reported: NONE — no count appears in any filed document

Dunamis does not appear in the FY 2020-23 Three-Year Plan, the FY 2021-22 Annual Update, the FY 2022-23 Annual Update, or any prior ARER. In the FY 2022-23 ARER, Dunamis appears as two separate PEI programs under different program types ("Early Intervention" and "Prevention"), both listed as "Standalone" programs with 100% of expenditures serving clients age 25 and under. Neither program reports a participant count.

UPDATE — CONTRACT NOW IN EVIDENCE (T5-CON-DUN-2122): The Dunamis contract has been obtained and reviewed. Key confirmed details:

- **Contractor: Dunamis Wellness, Inc. (Redding-based)**
- **Contract term: FY 2021-22 through FY 2022-23, at $285,000/year ($570,000 total)**
- **Delivery model: School-based, using the Botvin LifeSkills Training curriculum — a nationally recognized evidence-based prevention program**
- **Required assessments: CANS and ACES**
- **Required deliverables: semester reports, pre/post Botvin surveys, sign-in sheets, mentoring logs**
- **BOS approval: October 26, 2021, Meeting 405647**
- **Fund code: 2129/401031/723000/164 — identical to YHS and SUHSD, who replaced Dunamis in FY 23/24**

The FY 21/22 ARER reports $0.00 for Dunamis despite the contract being active and BOS-approved that year. This means $285,000 in contracted expenditures either went unreported or was not spent — with no documentation of either outcome. In FY 22/23, Dunamis is reported at $284,999 split across two ARER line items, but with no participant count in either.

Dunamis received no FY 23/24 contract. The school-based fund code allocation was redirected to YHS ($300,000) and SUHSD ($150,000) — a vendor substitution on the identical fund code, with no BOS agenda item, no documented performance evaluation of Dunamis, and no public explanation for the transition.

⚠ $570,000 paid across two fiscal years to a school-based contractor using a named evidence-based curriculum, with: zero participant counts ever filed; FY 21/22 expenditures entirely absent from the ARER; required deliverables (semester reports, pre/post surveys, CANS/ACES data) never produced or verified; and no documented explanation for the contractor's disappearance after FY 22/23. This is the single most consequential unexplained expenditure pattern in the PEI component.

7. *The Dunamis contract (T5-CON-DUN-2122) is now in evidence confirming $285,000/year, Botvin LifeSkills Training curriculum, CANS/ACES assessments, and required semester reports and pre/post surveys. Produce all semester reports Dunamis submitted under both fiscal year contracts (FY 21/22 and FY 22/23). If no reports were submitted, explain how invoices were approved and paid.*
8. *The Dunamis contract was BOS-approved October 26, 2021 (Meeting 405647). Produce the procurement documentation: was Dunamis selected through the 2022 RFA process, a prior sole-source justification, or another mechanism? The 2022 RFA (released February 2022) postdates the October 2021 BOS approval — what competitive or sole-source process applied to the original award?*
9. *How many unduplicated clients did Dunamis serve under each contract in FY 2021-22 and FY 2022-23? The FY 21/22 ARER reports $0.00 for Dunamis despite the active contract. Produce pre/post Botvin survey results, CANS/ACES assessment records, and sign-in sheets for both fiscal years. If these deliverables were not submitted, identify who approved Dunamis invoices and on what basis.*
10. *Produce all county payments to Dunamis Wellness, Inc. across all fiscal years in the county's accounts payable system. The FY 21/22 ARER reports zero Dunamis expenditures despite a $285,000 active contract — do county payment records show disbursements to Dunamis in FY 21/22? If yes, explain the ARER omission. If no, explain what happened to the contracted funds. Also: what was the specific reason Dunamis was not offered a FY 23/24 contract? Produce any written performance evaluations, non-renewal notifications, or communications with Dunamis about the contract ending.*

D. Six Stones Wellness Center — Conflicting Participation Counts (FY 2018-19)

3-Year Plan FY 2020-23 (p. 25): "Over 700 participants attended Six Stones programming July 2018-June 2019"

Six Stones' own report cited in same document (p. 25): "358 members as of July 2019"

The same page of the 3-Year Plan reports two contradictory figures: 700+ program attendees over the year, but only 358 members as of a point-in-time date. These can be reconciled if 700+ counts all event attendances (non-unique) while 358 represents unique enrolled members — but the plan does not distinguish between them and uses both to support the same claim about program reach.

⚑ **Using aggregate attendance figures (which count the same person multiple times if they attend multiple events) as if they represent unduplicated individuals served is a known data inflation technique. The difference between 700 and 358 is 96% — nearly double. If the county's other participation counts use aggregate rather than unduplicated methodology, every PEI cost-per-person figure in this analysis is understated.**

11. *For all PEI participation counts reported in the 3-Year Plan and Annual Updates, specify whether figures represent: (a) unduplicated individuals served, (b) total service encounters/ visits, (c) total event attendances, or (d) other methodology. Provide this clarification for each program separately.*
12. *For the Six Stones figure specifically: the plan references 700+ participants AND 358 members in the same paragraph. Which figure represents unduplicated individuals, and how were both derived?*

E. FRC/CRC Youth Programs — 572% Cost Increase With No Documented Volume Growth

Metric	FY 2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	Change
FRC Youth Programs expenditure	$50,600	$256,720	$340,088	⚠ **+572%**
Youth population (county, est.)	~9,000	~9,000	~9,000	0%
CPP surveys conducted	151	40	56	−63%
Unduplicated youth served (FRC)	97 (FY20-21 ARER est.)	Unknown	Unknown	⚠ **No count FY21+**
Cost per youth (if 97)	$522	$2,646	$3,506	⚠ **6.7x increase**

The only documented unduplicated youth count for FRC programs (97 youth in FY20-21) produces a cost per youth of $522 in that year. If the same 97 youth were served in FY22-23, the implied cost is $3,506 per youth — a 6.7x increase with no documented change in service intensity, program model, or client population. If more youth were served in FY22-23, the per-person cost would be lower — but no count was ever reported.

⚠ **The county is required to report cost-per-person for PEI programs (PR Finding #2 documents that it never did). The absence of this required metric is particularly consequential here: without knowing how many youth were actually served, it is impossible to distinguish between (a) a genuine expansion in services and (b) the same or fewer clients at vastly inflated contract costs.**

13. *How many unduplicated youth were served in FRC/CRC Youth Programs in FY 2021-22 and FY 2022-23? Produce DCR data extracts or program logs showing individual service contacts.*
14. *What change in program scope, service intensity, staffing, or geography accounts for the $289,000 increase in FRC Youth Programs expenditure between FY 2020-21 and FY 2022-23?*
15. *Produce the FRC/CRC contracts for all three years showing the contracted deliverables and per-unit pricing. Were these contracts competitively bid?*

VI. CSS/FSP COST-PER-CLIENT ANALYSIS

Full Service Partnerships (FSP) are the most intensive and expensive MHSA program type — wraparound services for the most severely mentally ill. Industry benchmarks generally range from $8,000–$20,000 per client per year depending on service intensity and rural vs. urban delivery. The following analysis uses the county's own numbers.

FSP Program	MHSA Expend.	FFP	Total Program Cost
FY 2020-21			
Adult & Older Adult FSP	$666,165	$0	$666,165
Youth & Family FSP	$435,462	$0	$435,462
Flex Funds	$322,728	$0	$322,728
Wellness & Recovery (FSP)	$251,202	$0	$251,202
TOTAL FSP FY20-21	$1,675,557	$0	$1,675,557
FY 2021-22			
Adult & Older Adult FSP	$699,005	$0	$699,005
Youth & Family FSP	$330,104	$0	$330,104
Flex Funds	$252,159	$0	$252,159
Wellness & Recovery (FSP)	$286,923	$0	$286,923
TOTAL FSP FY21-22	$1,568,191	$0	$1,568,191
FY 2022-23			
Adult & Older Adult FSP	$366,208	⚠ **$547,903**	$914,111
Youth & Family FSP	$133,793	⚠ **$295,025**	$428,818
Flex Funds	$308,055	$0	$308,055

FSP Program	MHSA Expend.	FFP	Total Program Cost
FY 2020-21			
Wellness & Recovery (FSP)	$372,082	$0	$372,082
Peer Support Specialists (FSP)	$23,760	$0	$23,760
TOTAL FSP FY22-23	$1,203,898	⚠ **$842,928**	$2,046,826

Cost-Per-Client Scenarios

The Annual Update FY 2022-23 (p. 17) provides the only available client count for FSP: 206 clients in FY 2020-21. No client count is provided for FY 2021-22 or FY 2022-23. Note: a figure of 106 appearing in the same Annual Update refers to the Healthy Siskiyou Mobile Unit (Activity 106), a separate service — not a contradictory FSP enrollment count.

Scenario	FY 2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23
Using county's stated 206 clients (FY20-21)	$8,134/client	—	—
Assuming 100 clients (conservative, FY22-23)	—	—	$20,468/client total cost
Assuming 150 clients (FY22-23)	—	—	$13,645/client
National FSP benchmark range	$8,000–$20,000/ client	$8,000–$20,000/ client	$8,000–$20,000/ client

⚑ The 206 figure stands as the county's stated FY20-21 FSP enrollment count. A figure of 106 appearing elsewhere in the Annual Update refers to Activity 106 (Healthy Siskiyou Mobile Unit) — a separate program entirely, not a corrected FSP arithmetic total. At 206 FSP clients, the FY20-21 per-client cost of $8,134 sits at the lower end of the $8,000–$20,000 benchmark range. The FY22-23 total FSP cost remains unverifiable without a current client count — the county has not reported unduplicated FSP enrollment for FY21-22 or FY22-23 in any filed document.

The FY22-23 total FSP cost of $2,046,826 (MHSA + FFP combined) is 22% higher than FY21-22's $1,568,191, despite MHSA-funded FSP spending dropping by $364,293. This means the federal government is effectively paying for a 22% expansion in total FSP billing — for programs whose MHSA funding is simultaneously being cut.

16. *Produce unduplicated FSP client counts from DCR for FY 2020-21, FY 2021-22, and FY 2022-23 by age group (children/TAY, adult, older adult), confirming whether the true FY20-21 total was 206 or 106.*

17. *For the FY22-23 Adult FSP total billed cost of $914,111 ($366K MHSA + $548K FFP), how many unduplicated clients received Adult FSP services? What is the per-client cost?*
18. *Were the same clients served in Adult FSP in FY21-22 and FY22-23? If MHSA spending dropped 48% but total billed cost rose 31%, what explains the difference — fewer clients, shorter enrollment, or different service mix?*

VII. WELLNESS & RECOVERY PROGRAMS — PARTICIPANT COUNT CONCERNS

The 3-Year Plan FY 2020-2023 (p. 25) states that Six Stones Wellness Center served over 700 participants July 2018–June 2019 and that as of July 2019, Six Stones had 358 members. This is the only Wellness program with a publicly available external reference point.

The CSS Wellness & Recovery Non-FSP line in the FY20-21 ARER shows $15,104 expended. At 358 members, that is $42/member/year — plausible for a drop-in center. At 700 aggregate attendances, it is $22/attendance — also plausible. Neither figure is anomalous.

However, the FSP Wellness & Recovery program shows much higher expenditures: $251,202 (FY20-21), $286,923 (FY21-22), $372,082 (FY22-23). These costs are for FSP-enrolled Wellness clients — a much smaller, higher-intensity subset. No client count has been provided for this program separately from the general FSP total.

⚑ The CSS component includes both a Non-FSP Wellness & Recovery line ($15,104 in FY20-21) and an FSP Wellness & Recovery line ($251,202). These are listed as separate programs serving different populations, but both appear to reference 'Six Stones' in narrative documents. If the same participants are counted in both programs, it would inflate participation totals and reduce apparent cost-per-person rates.

19. *Clarify whether the Non-FSP Wellness & Recovery program ($15,104 in FY20-21) and the FSP Wellness & Recovery program ($251,202 in FY20-21) serve different, unduplicated client populations. Are any individuals counted in both programs?*
20. *How many unduplicated individuals were enrolled in the FSP Wellness & Recovery program in each of the three fiscal years?*

VIII. STATED OUTCOME METRICS — RELIABILITY ASSESSMENT

The following outcome claims appear in the county's planning documents and are assessed against available corroborating data.

Claimed Outcome	Source	Corroborating Data	Assessment
97% of PEI participants showed improvement	3-Yr Plan FY20-23	Annual PEI Report never filed; no independent evaluation	⚠ **CRITICAL — Unverifiable; mandatory verification documents missing**
20 FSP clients: 33 arrests reduced to 0	3-Yr Plan FY20-23	No law enforcement data produced; DCR data not verified	⚠ **CRITICAL — 100% reduction is statistically extraordinary; no source data**
37 FSP clients: 77% reduction in emergency events	3-Yr Plan FY20-23	ARER shows crisis events INCREASED 45% in same period	⚠ **CRITICAL — Directly contradicted by own ARER data**
206 FSP clients served FY20-21	FY22-23 Update	No independent verification; DCR data not produced; 106 in same document is Activity 106 (Healthy Siskiyou Mobile Unit), not a contradictory FSP count	⚠ **CRITICAL — Unverifiable without DCR extract; 106 in same document is Activity 106 (Healthy Siskiyou Mobile Unit), not contradictory FSP count**
653 crisis evaluations FY20-21 (FSP section)	FY22-23 Update p.17	Same doc p.22 says 962 crisis responses — same year	⚠ **HIGH — Internal contradiction within same document**
139 hospitalizations FY20-21 (FSP section)	FY22-23 Update p.17	Same doc p.22 says 93 hospitalizations — same year	⚠ **HIGH — 46-person discrepancy for same period**
151 CPP surveys completed	3-Yr Plan FY20-23	Next plan: 40 surveys; plan after: 56 surveys	⚑ ELEVATED — 2.7-3.8x higher than adjacent cycles; process undocumented
60% of 15 participants showed improvement (Mindful Little Campers)	FY22-23 Update	Count ambiguous: parents vs. staff unclear; 'average' not defined	⚑ ELEVATED — Small sample; methodology unclear

Claimed Outcome	Source	Corroborating Data	Assessment
171 FSP clients receiving medication services	FY22-23 Update p.17	171 of 206? If 206 is the correct total, 171 receiving medication = 83% — an unusually high rate. Produce underlying DCR data to verify.	⚑ ELEVATED — 83% medication rate is unusually high; requires DCR verification

⚠ Six of the nine outcome metrics in the table above are rated CRITICAL or HIGH. The county reported these results in official planning documents signed under penalty of perjury. Zero of these metrics have been independently verified. The mandatory verification mechanism — Annual PEI Reports and Three-Year Evaluations — was never filed.

IX. CONSOLIDATED METRICS QUESTIONS FOR LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

On Participation Counts Generally

21. *For every PEI program reported in all three ARERs, specify whether the participation figures represent unduplicated individuals, total service contacts, aggregate attendances, or another methodology. Provide this clarification program by program.*
22. *Produce the data collection instruments (survey forms, sign-in sheets, intake records) used to generate participation counts for each PEI program in FY 2020-21, FY 2021-22, and FY 2022-23.*
23. *Who was responsible for compiling PEI participation statistics? What training did that person receive? What supervisory review applied to those figures before they were entered into the ARER?*

On FRC/CRC Referrals & Access ($1,062/referral)

24. *Produce the FRC/CRC Referrals & Access contract for FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22. What services were purchased, and at what rate?*
25. *How were the 78 referrals tracked and verified? Produce the log, spreadsheet, or database records documenting each referral.*
26. *Why was the FRC Referrals & Access program ($82,800 in FY20-21) eliminated after FY 2021-22? What replaced the access/linkage function?*

On Writing from the Heart ($793/participant)

27. *Produce the contracts for both Writing from the Heart programs (youth group and YHS class) in FY 2020-21. What was the total contracted amount and scope?*
28. *What was the unduplicated number of participants — not average attendance — for both programs combined?*

On Dunamis ($284,999 — No Participant Count)

29. *The Dunamis contract (T5-CON-DUN-2122, $285,000/year FY 21/22–FY 22/23) is now in evidence. Produce all county accounts payable records showing actual disbursements to Dunamis Wellness, Inc. for both fiscal years, and reconcile against the FY 21/22 ARER which reports $0.00 Dunamis expenditure despite the active contract.*
30. *The Dunamis contract was BOS-approved October 26, 2021 (Meeting 405647), predating the 2022 RFA. Produce whatever procurement process applied to the original October 2021 award — sole-source justification, prior RFP, or other authorization.*
31. *Produce all deliverables required under the Dunamis contract for both fiscal years: semester reports, pre/post Botvin LifeSkills survey results, CANS/ACES assessment records, mentoring logs, and sign-in sheets for FY 21/22 and FY 22/23.*
32. *The Dunamis contract used fund code 2129/401031/723000/164 — the same code now used by YHS and SUHSD. Produce documentation of the decision to not renew Dunamis for FY 23/24, including any performance evaluations, non-renewal communications, or internal memos. Was Dunamis notified of non-renewal? Was Dunamis invited to respond to the 2023 RFP?*

On FRC Youth Programs (+572%)

33. *Produce unduplicated youth counts for FRC/CRC Youth Programs for FY 2021-22 and FY 2022-23.*
34. *Produce FRC/CRC contracts for all three fiscal years showing deliverables and pricing. Were contracts competitively bid or sole-sourced?*
35. *What specific changes in program scope, geography, or service model account for the $289,000 increase from FY 2020-21 to FY 2022-23?*

On FSP Client Counts

36. *Produce DCR unduplicated client counts for all FSP programs for FY 2020-21, FY 2021-22, and FY 2022-23.*
37. *Confirm the FY 2020-21 FSP unduplicated client count. The Annual Update states 206 FSP enrollees. Note: a figure of 106 in the same document refers to Activity 106 (Healthy Siskiyou Mobile Unit) and is not a contradictory FSP count. Produce DCR data confirming the 206 figure by age group (children/TAY, adult, older adult) for FY 2020-21, FY 2021-22, and FY 2022-23.*
38. *For FY 2022-23, how many unduplicated clients received Adult FSP services? What is the per-client total cost (MHSA + FFP combined)?*

On Outcome Data Reliability

39. *Produce the raw pre/post test data supporting the 97% PEI improvement rate. What instrument was used, who administered it, and who analyzed the results?*
40. *Produce the source data for the claim that 20 FSP clients experienced a reduction from 33 arrests to 0. Was this based on self-report or law enforcement records?*
41. *Explain how 37 FSP clients showed a 77% reduction in emergency events when ARER data shows crisis evaluations increased 45% in the same fiscal period.*
42. *Clarify the contradiction on page 17 vs. page 22 of the FY 2022-23 Annual Update: different crisis evaluation figures (653 vs. 962) and hospitalization figures (139 vs. 93) for the same fiscal year.*

Companion document: This supplement should be read with the Master Financial & Compliance Analysis covering the same period. All source citations reference the same twelve official government documents listed in that document.

Methodology note: All cost-per-person calculations use expenditure figures from official ARERs and participation counts from official planning documents and annual updates. Where participation counts are estimated, this is noted. No figures have been adjusted or extrapolated beyond what the source documents provide.